

[Shri Tulsidas Dasappa] ३३

the officers' movement, it is unfortunate that the Managements of Public Sector Undertakings refuse to face the reality and try to diffuse the situation.

In this regard, my letters to the Chairmen, H.A.L., I.T.I., and B.E.M.L. to help restore the deteriorating morale of the Supervisory and Managerial personnel has not had the desired effect with the exception of an explanatory letter from the Chairman, H.A.L.

This callous attitude on the part of these Managements that they can treat a letter of a Member of Parliament so lightly as to not even acknowledge astonishes me.

I have, therefore, chosen to voice my concern and request the Government to intervene before the situation threatens to go out of control.

(iv) NEED FOR AUGMENTING PRODUCTION
OF RESIN

SHRI K. T. KOSALRAM (Tiruchendur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, with your permission I want to raise a matter of urgent public importance under Rule 377.

Need for augmenting production of resin, an important raw material for plastic (PVC) pipes. Plastics and Resins & Co. Ltd., of Arumuganeri (Tamilnadu) who are licensed to produce this material 'resin' which is the raw material for PVC pipes, have been declaring lay-offs for periods ranging from 7 months to 3 months as and when it suited them—even in 1978 they have declared lay off for three months with the result there is a critical shortage of resin and the production of PVC pipes has slackened. There appears to have been some imports of this material, but that is not sufficient. The unit which has been licensed and is located in Arumuganeri in Tirunelveli district employs more than 1,000 workers and it seems that since the owners are not able to make profits as they did in previous years, they have chosen to lay off the workers. It is very essential that this unit must go into production immediately and whatever decisions are needed to be taken, they should be taken. One such step would be to ask for the merger of this unit with Dharangdhara Chemicals, Arumuganeri both of whom are interconnected companies. Another would be for the Government to take over this unit as a sick unit. I have written to the concerned Minister, so far no action has been taken. This is one of the important raw material for most of the small scale industries. For want of this raw material

most of the small scale industries are only working one week in a month.

15.07 hrs.

**KHADI AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES
COMMISSION (AMENDMENT) BILL—
Contd.**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now, we take up the Bill further to amend the Khadi and Village Industries Commission Act, 1956. Shri Kadam. He is absent. Shri George Fernandes in deference to the wishes of the House wants to move a motion.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES) : Sir, I move : "That the Bill...."

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad) : Sir, I rise on a point of order under Rule 376 read with Rule 75 and Rule 345. I am glad the Minister is having second thought. Perhaps it would have been better if he had not brought the Bill before the House. The House may turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to occasional by-passing, if not violation, of the rules. But it is not good if it is done too often. Now, Sir, the Minister is moving an amendment to his own motion which he made a few days ago and in this respect I want to draw your attention to Rule 75, sub-rule (2) and section (a) which says :

"(a) if the member in charge moves that the Bill be taken into consideration any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House, or a Joint Committee of the House....."

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO : Sir, Rule 76 says that the member in charge can move an amendment.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH : Now, Sir, I come to Rule 345. It says: Notice of an amendment to a motion shall be given one day before the day on which the motion is to be considered. The amendment to this motion should have been given one day before that motion was considered. So, unless this rule is suspended by the House, the House cannot proceed with this particular amendment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We have had several instances and several precedents in this House where without suspending the rules we have had amendments to the motion and referred these bills to the Joint Committees in deference to the unanimous wish of the House. And in deference to the wish of the House the Speaker has permitted the amendment to be moved without suspension of the Rules. This has happened in five instances, namely, Extradition Bill, 1961; the Judges

Enquiry Bill, 1964, National Library Bill, 1962, etc. We have all these precedents. Therefore, I think the amendment can be moved. The Rule is also very clear.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH : Sir, two wrongs, three wrongs or four wrongs do not make a right. If you suspend the Rule, I have no objection.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, you have just now said that there are past precedents. We have just to accept them as valid. But, Sir, my point is different. There is no mention in the notice about the reasons for sending the Bill to the Joint Select Committee. Secondly, if you go into the record of the speeches made so far on this motion you will find that most of the speakers wanted that the Bill be thrown out. It was not that the House wanted it to be referred to the Select Committee. The House wanted it to be discarded. Only one or two wanted it to be sent to the Select Committee. So, where is the question of doing it in response to the wishes of the House? The House never said it should be sent to the Select Committee. The House wanted it to be discarded. Now, because of the stiff opposition, and also universal opposition, Government have found out a *via media* to hang on for a little more time. It is not a good precedent.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY : I think, Mr. Mavalankar, has missed the point. The House did not want to throw out the whole Bill. It wanted one clause to be taken out of the Bill.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR : Then nothing remains in the Bill.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY : If it is considered essential to consider it further and refer it to the Joint Select Committee what is the harm?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : Sir, Rule 345 is very clear :

“Notice of an amendment to a motion, shall be given one day before the day on which the motion is to be considered, unless the Speaker allows the amendment to be moved without such notice.”

The Speaker has already allowed and the Rule is very clear.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is allowed. Let Mr. George Fernandes move the amendment to his motion.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY
(SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES) : I beg to move :—

“That the Bill further to amend the Khadi and Village Industries Commission Act, 1956, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members. 20 from this House, namely :—

- (1) Dr. H. Austin
- (2) Shrimati Kamala Bahuguna
- (3) Shri Dinen Bhattacharyya
- (4) Shri V. Dhandayuthapani
- (5) Shri K. T. Kosalram
- (6) Shri Hari Shankar Mahale
- (7) Kumari Abha Maiti
- (8) Shri Rama Chandra Mallick
- (9) Shri F. H. Mohsin
- (10) Shri M. N. Govindan Nair
- (11) Shri Narendra P. Nathwani
- (12) Dr. Sushila Nayar
- (13) Dr. P. V. Periasamy
- (14) Dr. Ramji Singh
- (15) Shri K. S. Ramaswamy
- (16) Shri Sidrameshwar Swami
- (17) Shri Brij Bhushan Tiwari
- (18) Shri V. Tulsiram
- (19) Shri Sharad Yadav
- (20) Shri George Fernandes

and 10 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee ;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session ;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 10 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee.” (18)

श्री तेज प्रताप सिंह (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने एक प्रस्ताव आपके पास भेजा था जिसके द्वारा यह याचना की थी, यह मावेदन किया था कि संसदी जी इस बिल को एक सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सुपुर्व कर दें। मुझे खेद है कि मुझे कहीं पता जाना पड़ा और मैं यहाँ उपस्थित नहीं रह सका।

मुझे जब यह बिल प्राप्त हुआ, इसकी प्रति प्राप्त हुई तो बड़ा खेद और आश्चर्य हुआ। खेद

[श्री तेज प्रताप सिंह]

इस बात से हुआ कि गांधी जी के जो लोग निकट में, सप्तीय में रहे हैं, जिन्होंने उनको देखा, सुना और समझा है, वे कैसे इस बिल की ला रहे हैं। उपाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे भी गांधी जी को देखने और सुनने का अवसर मिला है। यह हो सकता है कि मैं उनको ठीक से समझ न सका हूँ। मैं यह क्लेम नहीं कर सकता हूँ कि मैं उनको ठीक से समझा हूँ। लेकिन जो कुछ मैं उन्हें समझा हूँ उससे मुझे इस बिल से प्रबन्ध धारण्य हुआ। हमारे बहुत से मित्रों ने कहा कि इसका ड्राफ्ट-राइट रिजेक्ट कर दिया जाए और खादी में पोलिस्टर न जोड़ा जाए, मैंने मेड फाइबर घर उसमें मिलेगा और खादी भवनों से वह बेचा जायेगा तो उससे खादी की भावना को ठँस लगेगी। मेरा भी यही कहना है कि इससे खादी की सारी भावना को समूल नष्ट कर दिया जाएगा। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि हम ठेकेदार नहीं हैं गांधी जी के विचारों के और यह कहने के कि गांधी जी को मैंने ही समझा है। यह बड़ी मुश्किल होगी अगर मैं ऐसा कहूँ। परन्तु जहाँ तक मैंने उनको समझा है, उसके सम्बन्ध में निवेदन करने का मुझे पूरा हक है। इसलिए मैं यह कहता हूँ कि इस बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी में ले जाये। जिसमें गांधीवादी विचारधारा के लोग रहें जिन्होंने कि गांधी जी को समझा है, जो उनके साथ रहे हैं। यही प्रण्टा होगा बजाय इसके कि इसे प्रती ड्राफ्ट राइट रिजेक्ट किया जाये।

प्रश्न खादी की भावना क्या है? गांधी जी इसे स्वदेशी का प्रतीक समझते थे। वे समझते थे कि हमारे यहाँ गांधीयों में कपास होता है, कपास बुनने वाले लोग हैं, उसमें श्रम लगता है, हाथ से काम करना होता है, यह सारी प्रक्रिया उसमें चलती है। अब जिस सेल में कपास नहीं होता है, वहाँ दूसरी जगह से धा सकता है। खादी में मैंने मेड पोलिस्टर मिलाने का प्रयत्न होगा खादी की भावना को नष्ट करना। इसका प्रयत्न यह न समझा जाए कि जो कोई पोलिस्टर पहनता है वह प्रण्टा नहीं होता है या पोलिस्टर कपड़े में मजदूरी नहीं होती है। मेरे कहने का यह भी तात्पर्य नहीं है कि जो खादी पहनता है वही प्रण्टा है। लेकिन खादी की जो भावना है, जो इकोनॉमिक्स है, उसके हिसाब से मैंने यह सब कुछ निवेदन किया है। खादी में पोलिस्टर मिला कर उसे खादी भवनों से बेचा जाए यह प्रण्टा नहीं होगा क्योंकि वह खादी नहीं रहेगी। इसलिए मेरा विचार है कि इस बिल को सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सुपुर्व कर दिया जाए।

जो यह कहा जा रहा है कि पोलिस्टर का बना हुआ खादी खादी भवन में बिकना तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह खादी खादी नहीं रहे जाएगा। यह मेरा मुख्य विचार ही सकता है, छोटा विचार ही सकता है। गांधी जी ने एक स्थान पर कहा था कि खादी को अगर कम्प्यूटीटिव बनाया जाएगा तो वह बिल कर जाएगी, किसी से कम्प्यूटीशन में टिक नहीं जाएगी, दूसरे कपड़े के नुकाबों में वह छड़ी नहीं हो सकेगी। इसके अन्वय भावना की

सी है? उन्होंने देश को सत्याग्रह का पाठ पढ़ाया था, सत्याग्रह की एक हथियार के रूप में उन्होंने कल्पना की थी। हथियार तमान हैं दुनियाँ में लेकिन सत्याग्रह वह बहुमुख्य हथियार है जिसका नुकाबला कोई नहीं कर सकता है। उसके साथ उन्होंने महिला की भावना, खादी की भावना और उसके संयोग को जोड़ा था। उसको सामने ला कर हमारे देश में जो उनके नेतृत्व में प्राप्त किया वह संसार में प्राथमिक है। उसके पीछे जो उनकी भावना सन्निहित थी क्या उस भावना से धाप इसको ला रहे हैं? धाप चाहते हैं कि खादी की बिना ज्यदा हो। प्राज्ञ भी जो खादी भवन चलाए जा रहे हैं उसकी टीका टिप्पणी काफी होती है। इन्स्टीट्यूट विभाग पर हुई बहस को मैं सुन रहा था। खादी भवन जिस प्रकार से चल रहे हैं, जिस तरह से उनका प्रबन्ध चल रहा है, जिस तरह से उनका प्रशासनिक ढांचा है उस सबको देखते हुए ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि खादी की भावना भर चुकी है। जिस प्रकार के धंधे और ढंग वहाँ पर अपनाए जा रहे हैं उससे ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है कि जो भावना इसके पीछे थी वह खरम हो गई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि पोलिस्टर बनी हुई खादी हमारे खादी भंडारों में बिकेगी तो खादी की जो भावना है, जो धारणा है, जो विचार है, जो स्पिरिट है वह समाप्त हो जायेगी। मैंने इसके बारे में संशोधन भी दिया था कि इसको सेलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजा जाना चाहिए। जो गांधीवादी विचारधारा के लोग हैं वे वहाँ पर अपने विचार प्रस्तुत करें। खादी पहनने में जो प्रानंद प्राप्त होता है जो उसके पीछे भावना होती है वह समाप्त हो जाए ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो यह नया विचार प्रयास है यह सिलेक्ट कमेटी में जाएगा तो इस पर वहाँ प्रण्टा तरह से विचार हो सकेगा और मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे व्यक्ति सिलेक्ट कमेटी में रहें जाएँ जो गांधीवादी भावना से प्रोत्प्रोत हों और गांधी विचारधारा को जानते हों।

SHRI B. P. MANDAL (Madhepura) : I have very carefully gone through this Bill and the main purpose of this Bill is to introduce man-made fibre and other things like appointing two more Officers or something like that are of no importance. On that point, there was much objection and opposition in this House and from every corner of this House, every Member had opposed it. When I opposed it, the hon. Prime Minister was here and I want to hear him as to what his views are about it because first of all, Gandhiji was against foreign goods, foreign cloth and all that and he was also against mill made cloth. Wherefrom will this man-made fibre come? There is no restriction that it will not be imported from other countries. Then the khadi prepared will be even from other countries; foreign goods will also be assimilated; khadi will be adulterated.

Another point is how is the man-made fibre made? I think big machineries are involved in making that. All these are very essential. The Bill should have been either sent for eliciting public opinion or should have been withdrawn; or before sending the Bill to the Joint Committee, I would like that at least the Prime Minister should apprise us because he is considered to be an eminent Gandhian. There are also other Members here in this House, Dr. Sushila Nayar and others and these hon. Members have opposed it. Had I learnt something from Morarjibhai as to what his opinion is regarding this man-made fibre, I would have been satisfied and I would have thought that I have still to learn something.

The main thing in this Bill is only the introduction of man-made fibre and to get khadi prepared from man-made fibre. There is nothing except that. I think the hon. Minister after taking into consideration all these things, respecting the consensus of this House, the views expressed in this House, would have done better if he had withdrawn this Bill, outright or at least sent it for eliciting public opinion. Therefore, I am not satisfied and I oppose it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have exhausted already even the extended time. Originally it was 2 hours; then it was extended to 4 hours. Even that has been exhausted.

SHRI T. A. PAI (Udipi): Please give me two minutes. The amendment being brought to the Act is mainly for extending the definition of 'khadi'. All the objections have rightly centred round including man-made fibre into khadi. Some hon. friends have suggested, let us refer it to Gandhians. I do not think Gandhiji has given the authority even to his closest followers to interpret what khadi is. It looks absurd. Why do you want to have a kadhji definition at all if it could include anything made by hand at one stage or the other? If the Select Committee is to be constituted only to include man-made fibre into khadi, I do not know what the Select Committee can do about it. You can even introduce it as a separate cottage industry even under the Khadi Commission. We would have no objection. But don't dilute the concept of khadi. I request the minister not to regard it as a matter of prestige and continue the old definition.

SHRI NARENDRA P. NATHWANI (Junagadh): Sir, I do not want to be a member of the Select Committee, particularly in view of the allegations being made that the Select Committee is being managed in such a manner as to put through the measure. Kindly allow me five minutes to explain my position.

It has been claimed here, a great controversy has been raised here and very impassioned pleas are being made that to include man-made fibre in khadi definition is sacrilegious, blasphemous and amounts to killing the soul of Gandhiji. I understand the depth of feelings in them, particularly some old workers like Maniben of Sushilaben. I do not claim to have drunk deep at the fountain source by way of association with Gandhiji, by staying with him. My friend, Shri Mavalankar raised the question whether Gandhiji would have tolerated this kind of dilution. With great respect, I submit that it is not proper to raise such a question. Please bear in mind Gandhiji's philosophy and general approach. His mind was not a fossilised mind so far as socio-economic problems are concerned. He used to keep an open mind and in the light of experience gained and the developments that were taking place, he would modify his views. Of course, he would never compromise with, he would not sacrifice moral principles. I do not say definitely that Gandhiji would have accepted this thing, but it is also equally wrong to say that he would have opposed it.

Let us see what are the realities. Let us examine with legal objectivity the situation that has developed today. What do we find today? So far as imported foreign raw materials are concerned, I asked a question to Sushilaben and she said that foreign *kapas* is imported and utilised in preparing khadi due to lack of indigenous *kapas*. Today that is the position. (*Interruptions*). Let us come to wool and wool tops. I did not find a single member on this side or that side in winter who did not wear woollen khadi prepared from Australian woollen Merino tops. (*Interruptions*) Let me say this thing, and I want to be brief. This is what Gandhiji said about self-sufficiency, about machine and about employment.

As regards the machine, he said:

"I entertain no fads in this regard. All that I desire is that every citizen of India who is willing to work, should be provided with employment to earn his livelihood. If electricity for even atomic energy could be used without ousting human labour and creating unemployment, I will not raise my little finger against it."

Acharya Vinoba Bhave said:

"If full employment could be provided to all citizens through large-scale industrialisation, I would burn my wooden charkha and cook the day's meal without shedding a single tear."

[Shri Narendra P. Nathwani]

Lastly, about self-sufficiency, Gandhiji explained that his concept of self-sufficiency was not very rigid; in the case of some commodities, the region may be a group of villages, a taluk, a district or even a province.

Now, I will explain about foreign imported material.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Nathwani, I warned you even at the very outset that at 3.30 we take up non-official business. It is past 3.30 now. You can continue later. Please take your seat.

SHRI NARENDRA P. NATHWANI: Please give two or three minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no question of two or three minutes. I am very sorry. You can only speak the next day, but not today. 3.30 p.m. is the time for non-official business and that is the end of it. Please take your seat. That is why I told you in advance. Please continue the next day. Heavens are not going to fall.

SHRI NARENDRA P. NATHWANI: Yes, I will continue.

15.32 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS—Contd.

NINETEENTH REPORT

SHRI VINODBHAI B. SHETH (Jamnagar) : Sir, I beg to move the following:

"That this House do agree with the Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th May, 1978."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 10th May, 1978."

The motion was adopted.

15.33 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. ABOLITION OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, we move on to further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Ramji Lal Suman on the 28th April, 1978:—

"This House is of the opinion that the Upper Houses (Legislative Councils) in the States have not served any useful purpose and in the process of legislation they are proving to be cumbersome and avoidably expensive and, therefore, the Constitution should be suitably amended to abolish them as soon as possible."

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The point of order will arise after one hour and 36 minutes.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to give you a proper notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, I got the notice. Now, Mr. Ram Sewak Hazari may continue.

श्री राम सेवक हजारी (रोसड़ा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राज्यों की विधान परिषदों को समाप्त करने के बारे में जो प्रस्ताव श्री सुमन ने प्रस्तुत किया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। आजादी के बाद राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी के सपने, और संविधान में दिये गये अधिकारों के आधार पर हमारे यहां लोक सभा और विधान सभाओं का गठन हुआ। लेकिन अंग्रेजों के समय जो राज्य सभा और विधान परिषदों का गठन हुआ था, उसी के आधार पर वे अभी भी चल रही हैं। किसी भी लोकतांत्रिक देश में लोकमत पर विश्वास किया जाता है और लोगों को मत देने का अधिकार होता है। संविधान में भी यह व्यवस्था है कि हर एक भारतीय एक ही वोट दे सकता है। तो फिर कोई विधान सभा या लोक सभा का सदस्य चुन लिया जाये और उसको उससे अधिक मत देने का अधिकार हो, यह बात हमें बेतुकी लगती है। इसलिए 1931 में भी जो गोसमैच कांफरेंस हुई थी उसमें भी गांधी जी का यही सपना था कि यह विधान परिषद् और राज्य सभा नहीं रहेंगी। मैं यह अर्जे करूँ कि विधान परिषदों के लिए जो प्राजा की जाती थी, जो उम्मीदें थीं और जिस समय संविधान की रचना की गई थी उस समय भी के० टी० शाह और श्री कामत जैसे माननीय सदस्यों ने जो विरोध किया था तथा डा० अम्बेडकर ने जो भावना प्रकट की थी कि वे जो भूमिका अदा